Optimal Measurements of Magnetic Flux in Superconducting Circuits and Macroscopic Quantum Mechanics

Tommaso Calarco[1,2] and Roberto Onofrio[1,3]

[1] *Dipartimento di Fisica "G. Galilei", Università di Padova, Via Marzolo 8, Padova, Italy 35131*

[2] *INFN, Laboratori Nazionali di Legnaro, Legnaro, Italy 35020*

[3] *INFN, Sezione di Padova, Italy 35131*

(February 1, 2008)

arXiv:quant-ph/9502001v1 1 Feb 1995

Abstract

A model of repeated quantum measurements of magnetic flux in superconducting circuits manifesting tunneling is discussed. The perturbation due to the previous measurements of magnetic flux is always present unless quantum nondemolition measurements are performed. By replacing the classical notion of noninvasivity with this condition, temporal Bell-like inequalities allows one to test the observability at the macroscopic level of the conflict between realism and quantum theory.

03.65.Bz, 74.50.+r

Typeset using REVTEX

Quantum mechanics, when compared to classical mechanics, shows two peculiar differences. Firstly, a coherent structure for the pure states and their dynamical evolution is present. Secondly, the evolution of the state of the measured system is unavoidably affected by the measurement process. A global understanding of the theory and its relationship to the classical limit requires to extend its validity to the macroscopic world. In this domain the conflict between its structure and the classical sense of physical reality cannot be overcome [1] and experiments aimed to compare the predictions of the two world views are crucial. With this spirit Leggett and Garg proposed experiments which could help to discriminate between the two structures in the macroscopic domain [2]. They introduced a class of realistic theories which do not satisfy the two abovementioned peculiarities of quantum mechanics, both in the sense that "a macroscopic system with two or more macroscopically distinct states available to it will at all times *be* in one or the other of these states" (*macroscopic realism*) as well as that "it is possible, in principle, to determine the state of the system with arbitrarily small perturbation on its subsequent dynamics" (*noninvasive measurability at the macroscopic level*) [2]. This leads the authors to a quantitative test introducing inequalities between correlation functions of observables of a macroscopic system, a superconducting quantum interferometer device (SQUID) subjected to a sequence of repeated measurements of magnetic flux. Besides extending quantum mechanics in a territory dominated so far by classical mechanics, any possible failure of quantum theory to describe the results of an experiment of such a kind could give limits on its validity whenever the intrinsic complexity of a macroscopic system can play an unknown role [3,4]. Measurement schemes following that path have been proposed both using a set of SQUIDs [5] and four-level atoms and mesoscopic structures [6]. In [7] experiments of this kind have been also discussed for observing topological effects due to the quantized structure of the vacuum. However, the proposal of Leggett and Garg has been criticized due both to the interaction with the external environment [8] and the limitations given by quantum mechanics to the repeated measurement of observables [9,10]. Furthermore, the statement that noninvasivity is simply a consequence of macrorealism, at the basis of the original argument (see the reply

in [9]), has been repeatedly discussed [11]. This last obstacle can be overcome by weakening the classical noninvasivity constraint in the so-called quantum nondemolition requirement [12,13], *i.e.* by using *quantum* measurement strategies which minimize the influence of the previous measurements on the predictability of the next outcomes. The whole argument remains now valid without any classical (*i.e.* incompatible with the Heisenberg uncertainty principle) assumption on the measurement process, but holds only for particular instants of time.

In this Letter we study quantitatively optimal strategies for repeated measurements of magnetic flux in bistable potentials which can schematize the rf-SQUID behaviour. Such a potential can be written as

$$V(\varphi) = -\frac{\mu}{2}\varphi^2 + \frac{\lambda}{4}\varphi^4 \tag{1}$$

where φ is the trapped magnetic flux, μ and λ are parameters associated to the superconducting circuit. Implicit in this assumption is that the rf-SQUID has been decoupled in such a way to neglect the influence of the external environment. This allows us to describe the system in terms of pure states $\psi(\varphi)$, although it has been shown that quantum mechanical predictions are distinguishable from classical models also in the more realistic situation of an overdamped regime [14]. Since general arguments exist on the fundamental noise introduced by any linear amplifier [15,16], the problem of the measurement of flux in a superconducting circuit is independent upon the detailed scheme used to detect the quantum state of the rf-SQUID. This happens also for the so-called null-result measurements, in which interaction with the instrument must occur leading to quantum noise fed into the observed system, as outlined in [10].

The model we use is based upon the path integral approach and the restriction imposed by a measurement in the space of the paths [17]. The standard quantum limit in a continuous measurement of position for nonlinear systems has been already analyzed in the framework of the path-integral approach [18]. This approach has been also applied to describe impulsive measurements in nonlinear systems [19] and to understand quantum Zeno effect in atomic

spectroscopy [20]. The measuring system is schematized by an arbitrary measurement output $\Phi(t)$ and an instrumental error $\Delta\Phi$, two parameters hopefully present for every meter. The effect of the measurement modifies the path-integral giving privilege to the paths close to the output $\Phi(t)$. The propagator of a system in which the magnetic flux is measured includes the influence of the measurement through a weight functional $w_{[\Phi]}[\varphi]$

$$K_{[\Phi]}(\varphi'',\tau;\varphi',0) = \int d[\varphi]\exp\left\{\frac{i}{\hbar}\int_0^\tau L(\varphi,\dot{\varphi},t)dt\right\}w_{[\Phi]}[\varphi]. \tag{2}$$

If the system is initially in a pure state described by the wavefunction $\psi(\varphi,0)$ the quantity

$$P_{[\Phi]} = \frac{|\langle\psi_{[\Phi]}(\tau)|\psi_{[\Phi]}(\tau)\rangle|^2}{\int|\langle\psi_{[\Phi]}(\tau)|\psi_{[\Phi]}(\tau)\rangle|^2 d[\Phi]} \tag{3}$$

where

$$\psi_{[\Phi]}(\varphi'',\tau) = \int K_{[\Phi]}(\varphi'',\tau;\varphi',0)\psi(\varphi',0)d\varphi' \tag{4}$$

can be interpreted as a probability functional for the measurement output. Due to the influence of the measurement an effective magnetic flux uncertainty arises

$$\Delta\Phi^2_{eff} = \frac{2\int\frac{1}{\tau}\int_0^\tau[\Phi(t)-\tilde{\Phi}(t)]^2dt\ P_{[\Phi]}d[\Phi]}{\int P_{[\Phi]}d[\Phi]}. \tag{5}$$

where $\tilde{\Phi}(t)$ is the most probable measure path which makes $P_{[\Phi]}$ extremal. In other words $\Delta\Phi_{eff}$ is the minimum dispersion of the path obtained for the most probable result of the measurement. In general the effective uncertainty $\Delta\Phi_{eff}$ is greater than the instrumental error $\Delta\Phi$, expressing the spreading of the paths due to the effect of the back-action of the meter on the measured system, unless the system is monitored in a regime unaffected by the quantum noise, *i.e.* when $\Delta\Phi \gg \sigma$ where σ is the width of the initial wavefunction $\psi(\varphi,0)$, or in a QND way [13,19]. For simplicity we represent an actual measurement with instrumental error $\Delta\Phi$ lasting a time τ through a weight functional $w_{[\Phi]}[\varphi]$

$$w_{[\Phi]}[\varphi] = \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2\Delta\Phi^2\tau}\int_0^\tau[\varphi(t)-\Phi(t)]^2dt\right\} \tag{6}$$

As shown in [18], the evaluation of the path-integral can be overcome by writing an effective Schrödinger equation which takes into account the influence of the measurement.

This allows to study a strategy which consists of a sequence of measurements of magnetic flux of duration τ equally spaced by a quiescent time ΔT in which no measurements are performed. The results were obtained in an impulsive regime as defined in [19], in such a way that the computed quantities do not depend upon the duration of the measurement. In this limit the collapse induced by the propagator (2) can be represented through the operator

$$\hat{w}_\Phi \equiv \exp\left\{-\frac{(\hat{\varphi}-\Phi)^2}{2\Delta\Phi^2}\right\}. \tag{7}$$

The initial wavefunction $\psi(\varphi, t_0) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} c_j \psi_j(\varphi)$, where the $\psi_j(\varphi)$ are the energy eigenstates having eigenvalues E_j, after a sequence of measurements $\{\Phi_n\}_{n=0,\ldots,N}$ at times $t_n \equiv n\Delta T$ becomes

$$\psi_{\{\Phi_n\}}(\varphi, t_N^+) = \hat{w}_{\Phi_N}\left(\prod_{j=1}^{N} e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar}\hat{H}\Delta T}\hat{w}_{\Phi_{N-j}}\right)\psi(\varphi, t_0^-). \tag{8}$$

With a particular sequence of identical outcomes, $\Phi_n \equiv \Phi_0$ for $n \leq N-1$, the wavefunction, after insertion of N completeness relationships, is written as

$$\psi_{\{\Phi_n\}}(\varphi, t_N^+) = \sum_{m,l=1}^{\infty} B_{ml}(\Phi_N, \Phi_0, \Delta T, N, \Delta\Phi) c_l \psi_m(\varphi), \tag{9}$$

where

$$B_{ml} = \sum_{\{n_j\}}^{\infty} W_{mn_1}^{\Phi_N}\left(\prod_{j=1}^{N-1} W_{n_j n_{j+1}}^{\Phi_0}\right) W_{n_N l}^{\Phi_0} e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar}\Delta T \sum_{j=1}^{N} E_{n_j}}, \tag{10}$$

and the W_{ij}^{Φ} are the matrix elements of $\hat{w}_\Phi$ on the ψ_j's. This allows to calculate, through (3), the effective magnetic flux uncertainty (5). We have checked that this technique gives the same results of the previous one described in [19] and allows to reduce the computation time by several orders of magnitude obtaining the same accuracy. Initially we have chosen a square-well of width $2\bar{\Phi}$ with a delta-like potential at the center, having eigenstates and eigenvalues analytically calculable (see for instance [21]). Besides the possibility to control the dynamical evolution in an analytic way the presence of a unique parameter, the height of the central barrier V_0, allows us to simply discuss in detail a number of features common to all the topologically equivalent potentials - like the one described by (1) - which exhibit

bistability. As already discussed in [19] the optimality of the measurement is dictated by the spectral properties of the system. The asymptotic collapsed wavefunction can be expanded in terms of the eigenstates of the potential and the optimal measurement is obtained provided that the quiescent time is commensurable to the characteristic times for the wavefunction reformation

$$T_{ij} \equiv \frac{2\pi\hbar}{|E_i - E_j|}, \tag{11}$$

where E_i, E_j are the energy eigenvalues which have maximal projections on the asymptotic state. The two eigenstates which maximally contribute to the wavefunction reformation after tunneling are the two states corresponding to the first and the second eigenvalue, whose splitting is related to the tunneling period.

In Fig. 1 we show the dependence of the effective uncertainty of the magnetic flux $\Delta\Phi_{eff}$ upon the number of measurements for different values of the quiescent time ΔT. It is evident that $\Delta\Phi_{eff}$ reaches an asymptotic value after few collapses around the measurement result, chosen to be $\Phi_0 \equiv \bar{\Phi}/2$, which has been verified to be the most probable result. The asymptotic $\Delta\Phi_{eff}$ depends upon the quiescent time ΔT. As we show in Fig. 2 the asymptotic $\Delta\Phi_{eff}$ has minima close to $\Delta\Phi$ when ΔT is a multiple of the characteristic period T_{12}. Unless the measurements are repeated with this periodicity noise due to the measurement process is fed into the system affecting the following measurements. In the limit of an impenetrable barrier the energy levels get twice degenerate and the even (odd) eigenstates are simply (anti)symmetric combinations of the half-well ones. Thus the spectrum of a wave packet symmetrically centered in the middle of one half-well shall not contain the eigenvalues E_{4n}, E_{4n-1}. For V_0 finite but high, T_{26} - or equivalently T_{15} - is therefore expected to be a good choice for the optimal quiescent time, as shown in Fig. 3, a magnification of Fig. 2 for short times. The periodicity linked to the intrawell time T_{26} is evident. This optimal period becomes increasingly important in the limit of opaque barriers, as shown in the insert of Fig. 3, where the optimal $\Delta\Phi_{eff}$ is plotted versus the height of the potential barrier V_0. Other cases with analytically calculable eigenstates and eigenvalues, namely the double

harmonic oscillator and the square well with a rectangular barrier in the middle, have been also studied, as we will report in detail in a forthcoming paper. In Fig. 4 we show the results obtained for the more realistic case of the potential of Eq. (1). In this case we have numerically evaluated the eigenstates using a relaxation algorithm based upon repeated collapses of a trial wavefunction subjected to measurements of energy [20,22] around the eigenvalues estimated with the WKB method. The behaviour does not differ from the case shown in Fig. 2, and the optimal period is still the tunneling time. The method allows us to describe a general set of repeated measurements. We have calculated what happens in the case of three consecutive measurements of magnetic flux, a case of crucial interest for the experiments on temporal Bell inequalities. An optimal set of measurements prepares the state allowing to define an asymptotic effective uncertainty approximately equal to the classical one, and after that the same quantity is calculated for a specific sequence of measurements. In the particular example in Fig. 5a) we show the result of this analysis for the case of two measurements, both with negative result, performed at times t_a and t_c (no measurement being performed at the intermediate time t_b). This corresponds to study the quantum limit in the sequence of measurements whose correlation probability is

$$P^{ac}_{--} = P\{\Phi(t_a) < 0, \Phi(t_c) < 0\}, \tag{12}$$

which has relevance for the study of quantum-mechanically predicted violations to the temporal Bell-like inequalities, as in [2]. It is evident in our particular example that the minimum effective uncertainty is obtained for quiescent times such that $\Delta t_{ab} + \Delta t_{bc}$ ($\Delta t_{ab} = t_b - t_a$, $\Delta t_{bc} = t_c - t_b$) is a multiple of the optimal periodicity T_{12} already individuated for a sequence of repeated measurements with the same result. We show also, in Fig. 5b), the behaviour of the effective uncertainty corresponding to P^{bc}_{+-}, defined as above. In all the considered cases it is evident that the predictability of the measurement outcome is affected by the uncertainty due to the previous measurements. One can minimize this by simply using optimal quiescent times which are analytically determined through (11) once the eigenvalues and the eigenstates are given. The particular Bell-type inequalities which involve correla-

tion functions between measurements performed at *these* times hold *without* any demand such as noninvasivity: therefore if the Bell inequalities were not experimentally violated in *these* cases, this would not be attributable to the Heisenberg uncertainty principle and could represent a *direct* confirmation of the realistic hypothesis.

Correlations between measurements of magnetic flux appearing in temporal Bell inequalities can be calculated in our approach according to (3,12). Thus we can verify for whose quiescent times quantum mechanics, including the measurement process, predicts violations of Bell inequalities. Observation of these last will be meaningful only if the quantum uncertainty resulting from the sequence of measurements still allows one to resolve the two half-wells, *i.e.* to identify two macroscopically distinguishable states. This will be the subject of a future paper [23].

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We acknowledge C. Presilla for crucial discussions and G. C. Ghirardi for a critical reading of the manuscript. One of us (T.C.) is grateful to M. Cerdonio and S. Vitale for the kind hospitality at the University of Trento.

REFERENCES

[1] J. S. Bell, see for instance *Speakable and unspeakable in quantum mechanics: collected papers in quantum mechanics*, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1987), in particular pp.14-21.

[2] A. J. Leggett and A. Garg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **54**, 857 (1985).

[3] A. J. Leggett, in *Direction in Condensed Matter Physics*, edited by G. Grustein and G. Mazenko (World Scientific, Singapore, 1986), pp. 187-248.

[4] A. J. Leggett, Suppl. Prog. Theor. Phys. **69**, 80 (1980).

[5] C. D. Tesche, Phys. Rev. Lett. **64**, 2358 (1990).

[6] J. P. Paz and G. Mahler, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 3235 (1993).

[7] J. Ellis, S. Mohanty, and D. V. Nanopoulos, Phys. Lett. B **235**, 305 (1990)

[8] R. H. Kraichman, Phys. Rev. Lett. **54**, 2723 (1985); see also the reply of A. J. Leggett and A. Garg , Phys. Rev. Lett. **54**, 2724 (1985).

[9] L. E. Ballentine, Phys. Rev. Lett. **59**, 1493 (1987); see also the reply of A. J. Leggett and A. Garg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **59**, 1621 (1987).

[10] A. Peres, Phys. Rev. Lett. **61**, 2019 (1988). see also the reply of A. J. Leggett and A. Garg , Phys. Rev. Lett. **63**, 2159 (1989).

[11] R. K. Clifton, in *Proc. Symp. Found. Mod. Phys.*, edited by P.Lahti and P.Mittelstaedt (World Scientific, Singapore, 1990), pp. 77-88; S. Foster and A. Elby, Found. Phys. **21**, 773 (1991); L. Hardy, D. Home, E. J. Squires, and M. A. B. Whitaker, Phys. Rev. A **45**, 4267 (1992); F. Benatti, G. C. Ghirardi, and R. Grassi, Found. Phys. Lett. **7**, 105 (1994).

[12] C. V. Caves, K. S. Thorne, R. W. Drever, V. Sandberg, and M. Zimmermann, Rev. Mod. Phys. **52**, 341 (1980).

[13] V. B. Braginsky and F. Ya. Khalili, *Quantum Measurement*, K. S. Thorne editor (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1992), and references cited therein.

[14] S. Chakravarty and A. J. Leggett, Phys. Rev. Lett. **52**, 5 (1984).

[15] H. Heffner, Proc. IRE **50**, 1604 (1962).

[16] H. A. Haus and J. A. Mullen, Phys. Rev. **128**, 2407 (1962).

[17] M. B. Mensky, *Continuous Quantum Measurements and Path-Integrals* (IOP Publishers, Bristol and Philadelphia, 1993).

[18] M. B. Mensky, R. Onofrio, and C. Presilla, Phys. Lett. A **161**, 236 (1991).

[19] M. B. Mensky, R. Onofrio, and C. Presilla, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 2828 (1993).

[20] R. Onofrio, C. Presilla, and U. Tambini, Phys. Lett. A **183**, 135 (1993); U. Tambini, C. Presilla, and R. Onofrio, *Dynamics of Quantum Collapse in Energy Measurements*, to appear in Physical Review A.

[21] C. U. Segre, J. D. Sullivan, Am. Journ. Phys. **44**, 729 (1976).

[22] C. Presilla, U. Tambini, *A selective relaxation method for numerical solution of Schrödinger problems*, submitted to Phys. Rev. Lett. (1994).

[23] R. Onofrio, T. Calarco, *Testing temporal Bell inequalities through repeated measurements in rf-SQUIDs*, in preparation.

FIGURES

FIG. 1. Effective uncertainty $\Delta\Phi_{\mathit{eff}}$ versus the number n of repeated impulsive measurements of magnetic flux in a square-well with a δ-like potential at the center for different quiescent times, expressed in terms of the periodicity T_{12}. The result of the measurement is always taken as $\Phi_n = \bar{\Phi}/2$. We put $2m = \hbar = \omega = 1$, $\Delta\Phi = 1$.

FIG. 2. Dependence of the asymptotic effective uncertainty $\Delta\Phi_{\mathit{eff}}$ on the quiescent time ΔT for the δ-like potential in the square well. We put $V_0 = 500, \Delta\Phi = 2$.

FIG. 3. Dependence of the asymptotic effective uncertainty $\Delta\Phi_{\mathit{eff}}$ on the quiescent time ΔT on a magnified scale comparable to the characteristic time $T_{26} \ll T_{12}$. In the insert the dependence upon V_0 is depicted for $\Delta T = T_{26}$, showing that this periodicity is optimal in the limit of decoupled half wells.

FIG. 4. Dependence of the asymptotic effective uncertainty $\Delta\Phi_{\mathit{eff}}$ on the quiescent time ΔT for the potential in (1). In this example we have $\mu = 9.6$ and $\lambda = 4.382$ in such a way that 6 energy levels lie below the central barrier.

FIG. 5. Dependence of the effective uncertainties $\Delta\Phi^{ac}_{--}$ (a) and $\Delta\Phi^{bc}_{+-}$ (b) on the quiescent times Δt_{ab} and Δt_{bc} in the case of two sequences, each of three measurements, and a potential as in (1). In sequence a), the magnetic flux is measured at time t_a and t_c and not at t_b, and both the measurements are assumed to give as result a negative magnetic flux; in sequence b), the magnetic flux is measured at time t_b and t_c and not at t_a, and the measurements are assumed to give as results respectively a positive and a negative value.